DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 313 CS 504 362

AUTHOR Wenner, Lawrence A.
TITLE Gratifications Sought and Obtained: Model Specification and Theoretical Development.
PUB DATE 28 May 83
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (33rd, Dallas, TX, May 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Mass Media Effects; *Models; *News Media; Programing (Broadcast); *Television Research; Television Surveys; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS Discrepancy Analysis; *Gratifications Obtained; *Gratifications Sought

ABSTRACT

Uses of the gratifications sought and gratifications obtained distinction in explanations of media effects have taken two conceptually distinct forms. The discrepancy approach poses that the difference between what is sought and what is actually obtained, expressed effectively as a discrepancy score, significantly aids effects explanations. The transactional approach postulates that unique contributions of both sought and obtained variables may be masked when that difference is expressed in terms of a single discrepancy score. A study tested these competing models with regard to dependency on and frequency of viewing the network evening news and "60 Minutes." Telephone interviews were obtained from 306 male and female heads of households. Gratifications sought and obtained were each measured by 12 statements encompassing four categories of gratifications. Data analysis revealed that both models could be effective frameworks for understanding the role that gratification plays in mediating different effects. The transactional model explained program dependency more effectively than frequency of viewing. Conversely, the discrepancy model was more effective in explaining frequency of viewing than dependency. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED239313

GRATIFICATIONS SOUGHT AND OBTAINED:

MODEL SPECIFICATION AND THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

By

Lawrence A. Wenner
Department of Communication Arts
Loyola Marymount University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lawrence A. Wenner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper to be presented at the "Issues and Advances in Uses and Gratifications Research" Panel at the 33rd Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, May 28, 1983, in Dallas, Texas.

DRAFT: Not for quotation or citation

CS504362

INTRODUCTION

That people often times get more than they expect from media is not a markedly new idea. Certainly, people who have tuned in their local "happy talk" format television news show expecting to be entertained by the resident "crazy weatherman" or "sexy anchorwoman" and who, through circumstance, incidentally happened to find out about tomorrow's weather in Mexico City or something about an important national policy have experienced this phenomenon many times over. Given that getting more, or less, or something different than was desired from media represents a marked shift in the context of how an individual's agenda is set, it is undoubtedly important to understand the process by which this shift comes about.

Any approach to studying this process would necessarily have to consider what a person wanted from media in the first place in conjunction with an appraisal of what that person actually got prior to attempting any understanding of the shift, let alone the consequences of that relative satisfaction or deprivation. As this notion of a "want to get shift" and its related expression as a "want:get ratio" (Lerner, 1974) can be understood, using different terminology, as a relationship between gratifications sought (GS) and gratifications obtained (GO), one might expect, given the preponderance of gratifications research in recent years, that much would be known about how shifts in gratifications occur and what effects they have on consequent behavior. However, as has been pointed out in a recent review of mass communications effects research by Roberts and Bachen (1981), demonstrations of "how gratifications sought and/or obtained mediate more 'traditional' effects . . . are more the exception than the rule" (p. 315).

More importantly, even though the conceptual differences between GS and GO are hypothesized to be crucial to theoretical development (Katz et al., 1974; Lometti et al., 1977), McLeod, Bybee, and Durall (1980) point out, that in certain practice, "the two concepts are confounded in many studies by the limitations of design and ambiguous question wording" (p.1).

Recently, research by Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (Palmgreen and Rayburn, 1979; Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn, 1980, 1981; Wenner, 1982) has countered this practice and addresses a number of theoretical issues surrounding the distinction between GS and GO. These studies have developed a variety of models which conceive of the GS-GO distinction in different ways, all of which have aided in the explanation of such things as public television exposure, news program choice, and dependency on both network news programs and the television newsmagazine program 60 Minutes. Further, Roberts and Bachen (1981) suggest that the most significant outcome of these studies is that "they find important differences between the two dimensions (GS and GO) which argues against the teleological criticism that any gratification sought must be obtained, and raises several new theoretical issues" (p. 317).

One of those theoretical issues concerns the question of model specification. While all of the conceptions of the GS-GO distinction in the Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn studies have yielded evidence that the distinction is important in adding to the explanation of a variety of effects, there has been no clear articulation of what the modeling alternatives are and no systematic testing of those alternatives.

The present study addresses this problem of model articulation and testing in a parsimonious way. The approaches to using the GS-GO distinction in explanations of media effects have taken two conceptually distinct forms---the discrepancy approach and the transactional approach.

The discrepancy approach (Palmgreen and Rayburn, 1979; Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn, 1981) poses that the difference between what is sought and what is actually obtained (or between what is obtained from competing media sources) is what is most important and can be expressed effectively as a discrepancy score which will significantly aid effects explanations. The transactional approach(Wenner, 1982) postulates that the discrepancy between what is sought and obtained may not be the most important consideration, and that there may be unique contributions of both the sought and obtained variables which may be masked when that distinction is expressed in terms of a single discrepancy score.

The present study will provide a test of these two competing models in the prediction of two related consequences--dependency on a program, and frequency of watching a program. More specifically, the competing models will be tested with regards to dependency and frequency of viewing two kinds of television news programs; the network evening news and the newsmagazine 60 Minutes. Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) have shown a discrepancy model to be effective in predicting frequency of exposure to public television, and Wenner (1982) has found the transactional model to be effective in predicting dependency on both the network evening news programs and 60 Minutes. Given these preliminary findings, it can be hypothesized that the discrepancy model might be most effective in the explanation of frequency of exposure, while the transactional model might be most effective in aiding the explanation of dependency. It should be noted that neither the justification for the hypotheses, nor the modeling itself has been well articulated at this point in uses and gratifications research. As the transactional model has been more clearly defined (Wenner, 1982), that model's specification will be considered first.

A Transactional Gratifications Sought and Obtained Model

The notion of a transactional GS-GO model is clearly derivative of the seven part Katz et al. (1974) process model describing the uses and gratifications approach. While the model, as outlined by Wenner (1982), does not present the uses and gratifications process in as complex terms as the Katz et al. (1974) conceptualization, it specifies a similar hierarchy of variables which first considers demographic and habitual media exposure variables prior to the ordered evaluation of the GS and GO measures in predicting a given media effect. A less complex hierarchical transactional approach has been used with relative success in determining the unique contributions of gratifications sought measures in political effects analysis (see McLeod and Becker, 1974; Becker et al., 1979; McLeod et al., 1979). For example, McLeod and Becker (1974) report that "our results give strong encouragement to a transactional model of additive media effects" where "exposure characteristics of the message combine with the orientations of the audience member in producing an effect" (pp.141, 160). While these studies do not consider the distinction between GS and GO, they do provide consistent evidence that gratification measures provide significant explanatory power over and above that explained by demographic and media exposure variables in predicting media effects.

Given the Palmgreen et al. (1980) finding that the GS-GO relationship is not one which tends towards isomorphism, there is further reason to believe that a transactional model which incorporates a distinction between GS and GO could provide a more powerful explanation of many media effects. The Wenner (1982) finding that "even after the effects of demographic factors, habitual media exposure, gratifications sought, and program attention level were held constant in regression analyses, the gratifications obtained measures were able to explain significant amounts

of additional variance in dependency on both the most watched network news program and 60 Minutes" (p. 559) provides some proof of this, at least in terms of understanding media dependencies.

The Wenner (1982) model used to predict media dependency will be retested here and its logic extended to the prediction of frequency of viewing news programs. The resulting two parallel transactional models will each be tested with regards to dependency and viewing of the two types of television news programs---the network evening news and 60 Minutes. The transactional models used here will follow Wenner's (1982) reasoning that each model should

> . . . take account of demographic factors first, since they are the most pervasive and, in good part, shape other influences. Since an individual's pattern of habitual media exposure to a large extent tends to shape his or her expectations, and thus gratifications sought, factors pertaining to this should be taken into account after the demographic factors. The influence of gratifications sought should be considered next, followed by an assessment of the attention level of the individual to the mediated content which could largely modify the influences of the last set of factors, the gratifications perceived to be obtained (p. 544).

In total, four tests of the transactional model will be made. Two of these tests concern dependency hypotheses with regards to network news and 60 Minutes that postulate that the prediction of the amount of dependency will be significantly improved by the addition of gratifications obtained measures to a hierarchical model which first controls for the ordered effects of demographic factors, habitual media exposure, gratifications sought, and attention level to the program. The remaining two tests of the model are set in the context of frequency of viewing hypotheses for the two types of programs, and suggest that the prediction of the amount of viewing will be significantly improved by the addition of gratifications obtained measures to a hierarchical model which first controls for the ordered effects of demographic factors, habitual media

exposure, gratifications sought, and attention level to the program. The attention level block in the frequency of viewing analyses will be conceptually extended a bit to include a measure of dependency as well; making this last block more of a context of viewing grouping of variables. This altering of the attention block to include other context of viewing variables seems consistent with the Wenner (1982) model and incorporates, through the dependency measure, some concern for the salience or relevance of the gratification context as is suggested by the expectancy value formulation as outlined recently by Palmgreen and Rayburn (1982) and Galloway and Meek (1981). The four tests using the transactional model will be contrasted with similar tests using a discrepancy model as outlined below.

A Discrepancy Gratifications Sought and Obtained Model

Research to this point using the concept of gratification discrepancies has been useful in predicting such things as public television exposure (Palmgreen and Rayburn, 1979) and which one of the three network evening newscasts people tend to watch (Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn, 1981). While the approaches to the construction of the gratification discrepancy scores in these studies have differed, these differences can be seen to be related to the type of prediction being made in the studies. Nonetheless, regardless of the approach taken, there have been conceptual problems in the specification of the gratification discrepancy.

Consider, for example, the Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) model which

> states that exposure (or consumption) is a function of the average absolute discrepancy between the gratifications which the audience member is seeking and the extent to which he perceives he is obtaining these gratifications. Following McGuire's (1974) learning theory reasoning we would expect that the smaller the average absolute discrepancy between GS and GO, the higher the observed exposure. The absolute value of the discrepancy is used because it is assumed that negative and positive discrepancies carry equal weight in determining exposure (p. 159).

Even though the Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) model tested well in the prediction of exposure to public television, their defense of using the absolute GS-GO discrepancy may be based on a faulty assumption. Their logic that a given level of relative satisfaction (e.g., where GO exceeds GS) is equivalent to a comparable level of relative deprivation (e.g., where GS exceeds GO) seems questionable and is inconsistent with previous research findings. The most noticeable contradiction is with Becker's (1979) conclusions that "it is quite clear that the avoidance motivations are empirically quite distinct from the positive gratifications" and that "avoidances are not mirror-opposites of the gratifications" (p.72). Related are Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn's (1980) assertations that, from the GS-GO approach, "there is no reason to equate 'avoidances' with 'uses'" and "the avoidance behavior (or dissatisfaction) can be more accurately measured as the discrepancy between gratifications sought and gratifications obtained" (pp. 168-169). Clearly, implicit here is their own advocacy of an important distinction between positive and negative GS-GO discrepancies. Thus, taking this evidence into account with the need to maximize useful information about the different levels of GS and GO, the discrepancy model used here will use an actual, rather than absolute value, measurement of the GS-GO discrepancy.

The Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (1981) discrepancy model has a conceptual base in a distinction between GS and GO, but it does not empirically consider the GS measure, concentrating instead on the actual discrepancy between GO measures from competing programs. Such an approach which compares GO measures from similar and competing programs may be particularly fruitful in understanding program preference and choice in those situations, as was the case with Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (1981), where the programs are of a like type. However, those situations where the choice of programs pits programs of a like type against one another

are comparatively few. Some examples might be the network evening news programs Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (1981) used in their study, network morning shows (ABC's Good Morning America and NBC's Today show), and perhaps some of the choices confronting children in Saturday morning's "kidvid" programming. However, programs which are both similar and competing are few and far between, with "counter-programming" more often giving the television viewer choices between programs for which they would have vastly different expectations, and a consequently different repertoire of relevant gratifications to be sought. In any case, the Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (1981) competing GO discrepancy model is not relevant here in the development of a discrepancy model to predict dependency and frequency of viewing a particular program.

The Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (1981) model does, however, share with the Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) model the weakness of using an average discrepancy score of all the gratification items used in their respective instruments. Thus, their results are useful in providing a theoretical proof of the general usefulness of gratification discrepancies in aiding predictions of media exposure and choice, but provide little understanding about how different categories (surveillance, entertainment, etc.) of gratification discrepancies might contribute to and influence these and other types pf predictions. Thus, the discrepancy model used here reflects additional distinctions among the gratification categories in an attempt to come to a clearer understanding of the predictive role of different types of gratification discrepancies.

In order to provide a more direct comparison with the tests of the transactional model outlined in the previous section, the GS-GO discrepancy model here will also follow the logic of a hierarchical ordering of variables such that demographic, habitual media exposure, and attention (or context of viewing) factors will be controlled for

prior to taking into account the predictive power of the gratification discrepancy measures relative to dependency of frequency of viewing network news and 60 Minutes.

Parallel to the testing of the transactional model, four tests of the discrepancy model will be made. Again, two of these tests concern dependency hypotheses with regards to network news and 60 Minutes The hypotheses relevant here postulate that the prediction of the amount of dependency will be significantly improved by the addition of gratification discrepancy measures to a hierarchical model which first controls for the ordered effects of demographic factors, habitual media exposure, and attention level to the program. The two remaining tests of the discrepancy model pertain to the frequency of viewing hypotheses for the two types of programs and pose that the prediction of the amount of viewing will be significantly improved by the addition of gratification discrepancy measures to a hierarchical model which first controls for the ordered effects of demographic factors, habitual media exposure, and context of viewing measures. Context of viewing measures here, as was the case in the transactional model, will include the attention level to and dependency on the program of interest.

METHODOLOGY

Telephone interviews were obtained in February, 1980, from 306 male and female heads of households in Iowa City, Iowa. Respondents' phone numbers were selected through systematic random sampling from the Iowa City telephone directory. To qualify as a respondent, an individual had to have a television set in working order and have at least "fair" reception of all three network affiliates in the Iowa City area.

Measurement

Uses and Gratifications. Gratifications sought (GS) and gratifications obtained (GO) were each measured by 12 statements (see Table 1) encompassing four categories of gratifications (with three statements in each category); (1) Surveillance, (2) Entertainment/Diversion, (3) Interpersonal Utility, and (4) Para-social Interaction.

Gratifications sought were measured in the following manner: "We are also interested in why people watch all kinds and types of news programs. Here are reasons other people have given. As I read each reason, please tell me how much that reason applies to you. If the reason very definitely applies, give it a 5; if it does not apply at all, give it a 1; if it applies somewhere in between give it a 2, 3, or 4, depending on how much it applies." The respondent was then read the list if 12 GS items in random order.

Gratifications obtained from the respondents' most watched network evening news program were measured after the gratifications sought. Questions about frequency of viewing the most watched network news program, dependency on it, and attention to it (see below) were asked prior to these GO items. Respondents who viewed a network news program at least once a week were instructed: "Now we'd like to know the extent the network evening news programs provide you with some of the things we've been talking about. Once again, I would like you to tell me how much the statement applies to the network news program you watch the most, the _____ News, using the

same 5 point scale that we used before."

Respondents then replied to the same 12 items (slightly reworded) used to measure GS. For example, for gratification 3, a CBS Evening News viewer was read the statement, "CBS News helps me find out what kind of job our government officials are doing."

Gratifications obtained from watching 60 Minutes were then measured using parallel instructions and formats for those respondents who watched the programs at least once a month. In addition to ascertaining the frequency of viewing 60 Minutes, respondents were asked about their amount of dependency on the program and the amount of attention they gave to it prior to being read the 12 GO statements. Again, the statements were altered slightly to fit the 60 Minutes context. Thus, for gratification 11, a 60 Minutes viewer was read the statement, "60 Minutes reporters are like people I know."

Four composite variables were formed within each of the three sets of gratification variables (GS, GO from network news, GO from 60 Minutes) by summing the scores of the three items defining a gratification category (see Table 1) for each set. This resulted in separate scores on entertainment, interpersonal utility, para-social interaction, and surveillance for each of the three sets of gratification variables.

Gratification discrepancy scores were derived from these composite variables by subtracting the GS score from the GO score for each composite gratification category. For example, the entertainment discrepancy score for network news programs was determined by subtracting the entertainment sought composite variable from the entertainment obtained composite variable. Thus, positive (greater than zero) scores would indicate the levels of relative satisfaction (or over-obtention) and a negative discrepancy score would indicate relative deprivation (or under-satisfaction or obtention). A discrepancy score of zero would indicate a perfect match of gratifications

sought and obtained and, as such, might be thought of as a state of achieving minimum satisfaction. The net result was eight composite gratification discrepancy scores; four pertinent to network news, and four pertinent to 60 Minutes.

Other Measures. The level of a respondent's dependency on their most watched network news program and on 60 Minutes was ascertained via two parallel questions asked prior to the GO items for the respective programs. For example, 60 Minutes viewers were asked: "If for some reason you couldn't watch 60 Minutes for a long period of time, how much would you miss watching it---very much, somewhat, or not at all?" This question and the corresponding one pertaining to the most watched network news program were scored on a three-point scale with the "very much" response indicating the greatest amount of dependency.

The level of a respondent's attention to the most watched network news program and to 60 Minutes was determined via two similarly parallel questions asked prior to their respective GO items. Thus, network news viewers were asked: "We also know that sometimes people do other things while they watch television. Which of the following best describes how much of a typical network newscast you give your full attention? About one-fourth, about half, about three-fourths, or all of the program?" This question and the corresponding one pertaining to 60 Minutes were scored on a four point scale for the attention ratings on the two programs.

In addition to the dependency and attention measures, four habitual media exposure measures were used: (1) time spent viewing television in an average day, (2) amount of newspaper reading per week, (3) frequency of viewing network news programs per week, and (4) frequency of viewing 60 Minutes per month. Demographic items measuring level of education, income, age, and sex were also included.

RESULTS

Parallel hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to compare the explanatory power of the transactional and discrepancy models with regards to four dependent variables: (1) dependency on the most watched network news program, (2) dependency on 60 Minutes, (3) frequency of viewing the most watched network news program, and (4) frequency of viewing 60 Minutes. The results from these analyses are summarized in Tables 2,3,4, and 5. In each of the analyses, the ordered influences of demographic factors, habitual media exposure, and attention to the program (or context of viewing) variables were controlled for prior to the consideration of either the GO measures or the GS-GO discrepancy measures. In testing the transactional model, the GS measures were controlled for prior to the consideration of the program attention and/or context of viewing variables.

Dependency on Network News

The results from the two analyses (see Table 2) give a slight edge to the transactional model over the discrepancy model in providing a good explanation of the amount of dependency people have on their most watched network evening news program. While both models demonstrate considerable power and are highly significant with regards to the total amount of variance they account for in the dependency score, the transactional model total of 39.4% represents 5.9% more of the total variance accounted for than the 33.5% total provided by the discrepancy model. The two gratification blocks in the transactional model account together for some 10.6% of the total variance, with the GO measures by themselves most significantly accounting for 6.1% of the total variance, even though added as the last block in the equation. This compares with the also significant 4% of the total variance accounted for by the

gratification discrepancy measures added to the equation last in the discrepancy model test.

Interestingly, using the transactional approach, both the GS and GO blocks individually accounted for more variance in the dependency score than did the GS-GO discrepancies in the discrepancy model explanation. In both approaches, none of the gratification measures account for as much variance as do the demographic and habitual media exposure variables (accounting for approximately 14% each).

The two models reveal similar trends in terms of the relative importance of individual variables to the predictive equation. Results for both models show relatively lower education levels and comparatively high income levels to be important in that prediction, as are the tendencies to frequently view both network news programs and 60 Minutes, while at the same time, viewing comparatively little television. Results concerning the influences of the gratifications measures show some consistencies as well. Obtaining relatively high levels of entertainment from network news in both models was important in explaining dependency. From the transactional model prespective this can be seen by comparing the negative (and almost significant) beta for the GS entertainment score with the positive and significant beta for the GO entertainment score. Evidence of the importance of obtaining more entertainment than was sought in understanding dependency can be seen by the significantly positive beta for the entertainment scores in the discrepancy model. In contrast with the discrepancy model, the transactional model suggests that obtaining relatively high levels of interpersonal utility may be more important than the level of entertainment in predicting network news dependency.

Dependency on 60 Minutes

Even more emphatically than the results from the network news dependency analyses, the results from the equivalent analyses (see Table 3) pertaining to 60 Minutes show the marked superiority of the transactional model over the discrepancy model in explaining program dependency. Again, both models accounted for significant amounts of the variance in the dependency score, but the transactional model total of 48.9% of the variance explained was, in this case, 9.1% more than the 39.8% total accounted for by the discrepancy model. Similarly, the two gratification blocks in the transactional model test accounted together for 15.1% versus the 6.2% which was accounted for by the gratification discrepancy block using the discrepancy model. The GO measures were even more dominant in this case, contributing an additional 11.9% explained variance in the 60 Minutes dependency score when added as a last block in the transactional formulation. However, in this case the discrepancy model usage of GS-GO discrepancies did, as a block, explain more added variance than did the GS block in the transactional approach, even though the GS block had been added comparatively earlier in that analysis.

There were again similarities in the models with regards to those individual variables of importance in the construction of the predictive equation. From the perspective of either model, the dependency on 60 Minutes was derivative of regular viewership combined with the tendency to read newspapers frequently, and was more pronounced with women than with men. Both models also show that obtaining a relatively unexpected high level of para-social interaction was linked to 60 Minutes dependency. The results pertaining to the transactional model alone point to the importance of high interpersonal utility and surveillance fulfillment as being important in understanding high dependency on 60 Minutes.

Frequency of Viewing Network News

Compared to the effectiveness of the predictions in the dependency analyses, neither the transactional model nor the discrepancy model did as good a job (see Table 4) in explaining frequency of viewing the most watched network news program. Nonetheless, a comparable situation exists in that both models did explain significant amounts of variance in frequency of viewing. Further, the transactional model accounted for more total variance in that score (34.8%) than did the discrepancy model (32.9%), although the difference in the effectiveness of the two models is much less pronounced than was the case in the dependency analyses. The only significant contribution from a block of gratification variables was from the GO measures in the transactional model test, where 1.1% was added to the explained variance in frequency of viewing. In addition, it is important to note that none of the gratification categories individually had significant beta weights in the two analyses, regardless of their conceptualization as GS, GO, or GS-GO discrepancies. Clearly, habitual media exposure variables, especially television and 60 Minutes viewing, were most important in explaining frequency of viewing network news. In addition, the two context of viewing variables (attention and dependency) took on more importance. contributing even more to the explanation of frequency of viewing than did the demographic variables.

Frequency of Viewing 60 Minutes

Both the transactional model and the discrepancy model were more effective (see Table 5) in explaining frequency of viewing 60 Minutes than they were in explaining frequency of viewing network news. Both models explain significant amounts of variance in viewing the newsmagazine program. As was the case in the previous analyses the transactional model explained more of the variation (39.1%) in frequency of viewing 60 Minutes than did

the discrepancy model (37.9%). In contrast to the analyses of frequency of viewing network news, the gratification blocks used in all of the analyses here added significantly to the total variance accounted for in frequency of viewing 60 Minutes. While the two gratification blocks used in the transactional model accounted together for 4.4% of the total variance versus 3.1% accounted for by the GS-GO discrepancy block employed in the discrepancy model, the GS-GO discrepancies account for more variance as an individual block than do either the GS or GO blocks used in the transactional model.

Similar to the frequency of viewing network news analyses, the results here show habitual media exposure variables (primarily network news viewing in this case) as most important to explaining 60 Minutes viewing. The context of viewing variables (primarily through the influence of program dependency) were even more important in these analyses, adding almost as much variance (approximately 13% in each analyses) to the total as did the habitual media exposure variables (14.5%). Additionally, results concerning the influences of individual gratification measures are of importance to the regression equations for both the transactional and discrepancy models. Apparent in results concerning both models is the relatively low attainment of interpersonal utility and para-social interaction gratifications linked to frequent viewing of 60 Minutes. Seemingly more important to explaining frequent viewing is the relatively low level of entertainment seeking indicated in the transactional model results and the related over-satisfied state of entertainment obtention indicated by the entertainment discrepancy beta weight in the discrepancy analysis.

Testing an Expanded Discrepancy Model

Taking into account that the results of relatively stronger predictions made by the transactional model may have been due, in part, to its specification of twice the total number of gratification items than was called for in the discrepancy model, an expanded discrepancy model was summarily tested to see if the initial model's predictions could be improved upon. The expanded discrepancy model was exactly the same as the discrepancy model used in the preceding analyses, except that discrepancies for the 12 individual gratification items from the questionnaire were used instead of four discrepancies reflecting the composite gratification categories. In addition, these individual gratification item discrepancies were grouped into blocks and entered into the regression equation in the following order: (1) surveillance, (2) interpersonal utility, (3) para-social interaction, and (4) entertainment. The order of inclusion reflected a rationale that the more socially normative gratifications (i.e., surveillance) with regards to news programs should be entered first because they are likely to provide much of the context for the less socially accepted gratifications associated with television news (i.e., para-social interaction and entertainment). In any case, the ordered blocking procedure allowed for a more systematic test of the expanded discrepancy model so that the influences of groups of gratification discrepancies could be determined with regards to program dependency and frequency of viewing both network news and 60 Minutes.

The regression analyses using the expanded discrepancy model showed that the original transactional model still provided a better explanation of both network news and 60 Minutes dependency. Nonetheless, the results for these analyses (not shown in tabular form for space reasons) do show an improvement over the initial discrepancy model in accounting for variance in the dependency scores. The expanded model accounted for 35.1% of the

variance in the network news dependency score versus 33.5% for the initial discrepancy model, and 39.4% for the transactional model. In the case of 60 Minutes dependency, the expanded model made more marked gains, accounting for 45.4% versus the 39.8% explained by the initial discrepancy model, and the 48.9% determined by the transactional model.

The results (see Table 6) pertaining to explanations of frequency of viewing, show that the expanded discrepancy model does a better job than does the transactional model in both the case of network news and 60 Minutes. With regards to frequency of viewing network news, the expanded model accounted for 36.3% of the total variance compared to 32.9% for the original discrepancy model, and 34.8% for the transactional model. While in the original model conceptualization, the gratification discrepancies account for only 0.7% of the total variance, the four discrepancy blocks in the expanded model together account for 4.1%. Two gratification discrepancy blocks in the expanded model--para-social interaction and entertainment--add significantly to the accounted variance total, even though they are the last two groups of variables added to the analysis. Most notably, the expanded analysis points out the important role that getting the sense that "reporters are like people I know" plays in frequent network news viewing.

The expanded discrepancy model did an even better job of improving the explanation of frequency of viewing 60 Minutes. Here the expanded model accounted for 42.8% of the total variance as compared to the 37.9% for the original discrepancy model, and 39.1% for the transactional model. The total variance which was added by the gratification discrepancy blocks in the expanded model totaled 8.0% versus the 3.1% added by the original discrepancy model. The interpersonal utility, para-social interaction, and entertainment discrepancy blocks added last into the equation all added significant amounts of variance to the total. As was

the case in the original discrepancy model test results, the expanded model results point to relatively low fulfillment of interpersonal utility gratifications (specifically "passing information") and para-social interaction gratifications (specifically "reporters give a human quality to the news") as indicative of frequent 60 Minutes viewing. The results also show that the feeling that "issues affecting people like myself" appear more often than expected and contributes to frequent viewing of 60 Minutes.

DISCUSSION

Perhaps most striking from the results of the analyses presented here is the consistency with which gratifications measures, regardless of how they are derived, make significant additions to the explanations of the amounts of dependency and viewing of both network evening news programs and 60 Minutes. Thus, the results here provide evidence that both the transactional and discrepancy models can be effective frameworks from which to understand the roles gratifications play in mediating different kinds of effects. In addition, the results were also consistent with the general hypotheses posed at the outset which were suggested by previous research findings (Palmgreen and Rayburn, 1979; Wenner, 1982). Here it was found that the transactional model was more effective in its explanation of program dependency than in the explanation of frequency of viewing. Conversely, the discrepancy model was more effective in its explanation of frequency of viewing than in the explanation of dependency. Nonetheless, the results are fairly convincing in showing a consistency in the relative superiority of the transactional model over the dependency model in providing generally more powerful explanations of both dependency and viewing network news and 60 Minutes.

Much of the edge of the transactional model over the discrepancy model in explaining variance in dependency and viewing can be traced to the GO measures. In each of the four analyses using the transactional model, the GO measures accounted for more additional variance than did the GS measures, even though the GO measures were added last in the regression equation. In addition, this was more clearly the case in the two dependency analyses. This is especially interesting in that dependency can be conceived of as a belief about the importance of the programs, while the frequency of viewing measures approximate behaviors with regards to the programs. What is evident here is that this belief or sense of dependency is more related to the actual obtainment level of certain gratifications (which vary with regards to the program) than it is to the relative obtainment level as expressed in the discrepancy model. Put another way, the gratification obtainment level, regardless of how closely it approximates the seeking level, seems most relevant to the consequent level of dependency. Given this, it would be important to test through a process model the hypothesis that, over time, high dependency derived from the actual obtainment of certain gratifications would feedback into the model and increase habitual exposure to a program (and similar programs) and cause a consequent alteration in the gratifications sought of the particular program type, and thus lessen the degree of discrepancy between GS and GO. Additionally, it would be of importance to see whether, over time, this would result in the rise of the actual GO levels and cause a concommitant rise in the level of dependency on a given program. It very well might be that there is a terminal level of GO associated with a program, regardless of GS, and that this will in large part determine a terminal level of dependency on a program. In any case, the results point to a need to develop a process model which could test the influences that beliefs about a program at a given time have on

consequent gratification seeking, exposure, and beliefs about that program.

Results concerning the discrepancy model indicate that this model is most potent in its expanded form and when used to explain the frequency of viewing network evening news programs and 60 Minutes. The most interesting outcome of these analyses of the expanded discrepancy model was the consistency with which non-surveillance gratification discrepancies added significantly to the explained variance in the frequency of viewing measures for both network news and 60 Minutes. Considering the case that Wenner (1982) has made that surveillance is "the area ostensibly most closely related to the manifest function of television news" (p. 558), it can be reasoned that the findings here provide a preliminary validation of the implicit assumptions made by television programming executives that it is those other non-news oriented characteristics of a news program which will ultimately determine its popularity.

In addition, the relative success of the expanded discrepancy model in using individual gratification item discrepancies suggests that there may be inherent problems in using average gratification scores, regardless of the model specified. This is consistent with observations made earlier concerning the use of average discrepancy scores by Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (1981) and Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) in a way that would obliterate understandings about how different categories of gratification discrepancies might contribute to predictions of media effects. However, this problem remains to some degree whether the gratification scores are averaged over all items used in an instrument or averaged or summed over gratification items within any one apriori category. With the averaging of gratification scores there is always the danger of losing information important to an explanation. For instance, there is the possibility of having conflicting trends in within-category gratification discrepancies cancel each other out with the net result being a faulty conclusion that

gratification discrepancies of a certain kind are not important. The results here suggest that caution should be taken in interpreting future research when using averaging strategies for deriving gratification scores. Clearly, some gratifications are more relevant than others (even in the same apriori category) in determining frequency of viewing, or other outcomes, such as program choice. One way to take this into consideration would be to develop weighting strategies, perhaps along the lines of the expectancy value formulation as proposed by Palmgreen and Rayburn (1982), that could provide added reliability to the gratification measures that are used in explanations of media effects.

While the evidence pointing to the effectiveness of the expanded discrepancy model in explaining frequency of viewing is convincing, there are inherent theoretical advantages to pursuing the transactional model more rigorously. In that the results show that the transactional model generally provides more accurate explanations while providing more easily decipherable information by clearly making a distinction between GS and GO, the model, in most instances, should be more conducive to theoretical development. Evidence of this can be seen in the regularity with which the sign (positive or negative) of the beta weights associated with the same gratification category differ between GS and GO conceptualizations in the dependency analyses. Especially in those instances where the beta for GS is negative and the GO is positive for the same gratification category, can there be seen clear cut evidence of gratification shifts being significant in making predictions. In these cases, overgratification, or getting more than one expects, is of particular importance in understanding dependency on a program. This can be seen most clearly in the network news dependency analysis with regards to entertainment, and in the 60 Minutes dependency analysis with regards to para-social interaction and interpersonal

utility. Further evidence of this can be seen in some secondary analyses on the data in this study which point to definite heuristic advantages to maintaining the distinction between GS and GO in understanding dimensions of relations between gratifications and different kinds of effects.

These canonical correlation analyses (see Table 7) parallel the structure of the earlier analyses by isolating demographic, habitual media exposure, and gratifications sought and obtained variables as the independent set used to predict frequency of viewing, dependency, and attention variables in the dependent set. Similar to before, parallel analyses are presented for network news and 60 Minutes. In each instance two sets of relations were significant between the independent and dependent set. Emulating the results showing the transactional model more accurate in explaining dependency, the largest Rc in each analysis was for the dimension of relations which showed a strong tie between the independent set and program dependency. Network news dependency was most related to the viewing of 60 Minutes, followed by low entertainment seeking combined with high entertainment obtention and high para-social interaction obtention. 60 Minutes dependency was most related to high para-social interaction obtention combined with low para-social interaction seeking, high surveillance and interpersonal utility obtention, and by the tendency to be female. The second significant dimension of relations in the case of both programs primarily linked frequency of viewing those programs with the independent set. Frequent viewing of network news programs was most associated with habitual television viewing, receiving comparitively little in the way of interpersonal utility gratifications, frequent viewing of 60 Minutes, and comparitively high education levels paired with lower income levels. Frequent viewing of 60 Minutes was most associated with frequent network news viewing, a high degree of seeking interpersonal utility of news programs but receiving comparitively little from 60 Minutes, low para-social

interaction obtention and again, the tendency to be female.

Most interesting about these canonical correlation analyses is that they confirm that dependency is most related to the independent set of variables, and that while dependency and frequency of viewing are inextricably related, frequency of viewing as a behavior is something quite different than having a dependency, which is a belief about the importance of a program. The results mirror those from the regression analyses in that the explanation for dependency was, in the case of both network news and 60 Minutes, stronger than similarly structured explanations of frequency of viewing.

What is most remarkable about the consistency of these results and all others from this study is that, in all cases, the results concerning 60 Minutes dependency and viewing were more conclusive than results of similar analyses pertaining to network news. One explanation for this centers around the role that the level of abstraction at which the gratification (whether it be seeking or obtaining) is perceived plays in reliably contributing to a prediction. As Palmgreen, Wenner, and Rayburn (1981) and Wenner (1982) have suggested, gratifications measured at a less abstract level will typically be higher than those measured at a higher abstraction level. Given Wenner's (1982) logic that "GO from 60 Minutes are less abstract than GO from the most watched news programs because 60 Minutes is one specific weekly program which features only three stories per week and any network evening news program is a less specific, more frequently appearing series of programs which within a given program typically features 20-30 stories" (p. 542), the more powerful results

here concerning 60 Minutes can be traced back to the lower abstraction level of perceived GO for that program.

In addition, the results here consistently point to the importance of context of viewing variables in intervening between that which is sought and that actually obtained. Future research should pay close attention to these and other variables (e.g., the locus of the viewing decision) which might play a crucial role in modifying GO in certain circumstances, regardless of the initial GS level.

One area of GS-GO research which may be of particular importance in the future is that which concentrates on distinctions between the media-rich and media-poor segments of the population. Lerner's (1974) research on technological innovations in developing countries has pointed to such difficulties as the "new revolution of rising frustrations" (p. 865) which comes about when aspiration exceeds achievement to a marked degree, resulting in "relative deprivation" in terms of an imbalance in the "want:get ratio." As the distinctions between GS and GO can be thought of in much the same terms, their application should be particularly important in studying the diffusion of personalized information technologies within the industrialized nations and the consequences of such "relative deprivation" among certain segments of the population which have been exposed to those technologies which bring expanded cable service and computers into the home, but who cannot afford them. This might be one very specific way that gratification research can contribute to the understanding of change, and offset the criticism that it is inherently a conservative position linked to the preservation of the status quo.

Table 1. -- Gratifications Sought Items Listed by Category

Surveillance

1. I watch TV news to help me make up my mind about the important issues of the day.

2. I watch TV news to find out about issues affecting people like myself.

3. I watch TV news to find out what kind of job our government officials are doing.

Entertainment/Diversion

4. I watch TV news because it helps me to relax.

5. I watch TV news because its often entertaining.

6. I watch TV news because its often dramatic.

Interpersonal Utility

7. I watch TV news to give me interesting things to talk about.

8. I watch TV news so I can pass the information on to other people.

9. I watch TV news to support my own viewpoints to other people.

Para-social Interaction

10. I watch TV news to compare my own ideas to what the commentators say.

11. I watch TV news because the reporters are like people I know.

12. I watch TV news because the reporters give a human quality to the news.

Table 2. -- Comparison of Multiple Regression Analyses Showing Transactional and Discrepancy Models in the Prediction of Dependency on Network Evening News Programs (n=195)

		Transactional Model		Discrepancy Model	
	r	R	Beta	R	Beta
Education	-.26*	.26	-.18*	.26	-.24*
Income	.21*	.35	.21*	.35	.23*
Age	.21*	.37	.13*	.37	.04
Sex	.11	.38	.05	.38	.09
TV Viewing	.14	.44	-.20*	.44	-.11*
Newspaper Reading	-.08	.45	-.01	.45	-.01
Network News Viewing	.35*	.50	.25*	.50	.23*
60 Minutes Viewing	.31*	.53	.16*	.53	.18*
Gratifications Sought:					
Entertainment	.08	.55	-.13	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.26*	.56	-.02	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.19*	.57	-.04	---	---
Surveillance	.19*	.57	-.04	---	---
Attention to News Program	.25*	.58	.02	.54	.08
Gratifications Obtained:					
Entertainment	.24*	.60	.18*	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.39*	.61	.09	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.35*	.62	.22*	---	---
Surveillance	.29*	.63	.10	---	---
Gratification Discrepancies:					
Entertainment	.26*	---	---	.57	.12*
Para-social Interaction	.22*	---	---	.57	.05
Interpersonal Utility	.24*	---	---	.58	.08
Surveillance	.12	---	---	.58	.06
Variance Accounted for by Each Block:					
Demographic Variables		.141*		.141*	
Habitual Media Exposure		.144*		.144*	
Gratifications Sought		.045*		----	
Attention to News Program		.003		.010	
Gratifications Obtained		.061*		----	
Gratification Discrepancies		----		.040*	
Total Variance Accounted For:		.394*		.335*	

* Significant at $p < .01$.

Table 3 -- Comparison of Multiple Regression Analyses Showing Transactional and Discrepancy Models in the Prediction of Dependency on 60 Minutes (n=173)

		Transactional Model		Discrepancy Model	
	r	R	Beta	R	Beta
Education	-.03	.03	.02	.03	-.05
Income	.08	.09	.05	.09	.10
Age	.04	.09	.05	.09	-.03
Sex	.33*	.35	.18*	.35	.24*
TV Viewing	-.02	.36	-.14*	.36	-.09
Newspaper Reading	.07	.37	.11*	.37	.10*
Network News Viewing	.10	.40	-.03	.40	-.01
60 Minutes Viewing	.43*	.54	.35*	.54	.38*
Gratifications Sought:					
Entertainment	.10	.56	.04	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.16	.57	-.16*	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.16	.57	-.10	---	---
Surveillance	.13	.58	.12*	---	---
Attention to 60 Minutes	.26*	.61	.12*	.58	.14*
Gratifications Obtained:					
Entertainment	.27*	.62	-.01	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.41*	.65	.26*	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.45*	.67	.16*	---	---
Surveillance	.46*	.70	.16*	---	---
Gratification Discrepancies:					
Entertainment	.20*	---	---	.59	.02
Para-social Interaction	.28*	---	---	.61	.18*
Interpersonal Utility	.31*	---	---	.63	.11
Surveillance	.29*	---	---	.64	.04
Variance Accounted For by Each Block:					
Demographic Variables		.124*		.124*	
Habitual Media Exposure		.169*		.169*	
Gratifications Sought		.032*		----	
Attention to 60 Minutes		.045*		.043*	
Gratifications Obtained		.119*		----	
Gratification Discrepancies		----		.062*	
Total Variance Accounted For:		.489*		.398*	

* Significant at $p < .01$.

Table 4. -- Comparison of Multiple Regression Analyses Showing Transactional and Discrepancy Models in the Prediction of Frequency of Viewing Network Evening News Programs (n=195)

		Transactional Model		Discrepancy Model	
	r	R	Beta	R	Beta
Education	-.08	.08	.10	.08	.11*
Income	.03	.09	-.07	.09	-.07
Age	.18*	.19	-.05	.19	.03
Sex	-.04	.21	-.07	.21	-.09
TV Viewing	.34*	.36	.33*	.36	.28*
Newspaper Reading	-.10	.37	-.03	.37	-.02
60 Minutes Viewing	.39*	.49	.22*	.49	.22*
Gratifications Sought:					
Entertainment	.02	.49	-.09	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.02	.50	-.05	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.12	.50	-.04	---	---
Surveillance	.06	.50	.07	---	---
Attention to News Program	.31*	.54	.18*	.53	.17*
Dependency on News Program	.35*	.58	.27*	.57	.23*
Gratifications Obtained:					
Entertainment	.13	.58	.06	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.08	.58	-.12	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.21*	.59	.12	---	---
Surveillance	.06	.59	-.10	---	---
Gratification Discrepancies:					
Entertainment	.17	---	---	.57	.04
Interpersonal Utility	.08	---	---	.57	-.00
Para-social Interaction	.15	---	---	.57	.04
Surveillance	-.00	---	---	.57	-.07
Variance Accounted for by Each Block:					
Demographic Variables		.043*		.043*	
Habitual Media Exposure		.198*		.198*	
Gratifications Sought		.007		----	
Attention/Dependency		.089*		.081*	
Gratifications Obtained		.011*		----	
Gratification Discrepancies		----		.007	
Total Variance Accounted For:		.348*		.329*	

*Significant at $p < .01$.

Table 5. -- Comparison of Multiple Regression Analyses Showing Transactional and Discrepancy Models in the Prediction of Frequency of Viewing 60 Minutes (n=173)

		Transactional Model		Discrepancy Model	
	r	R	Beta	R	Beta
Education	-.01	.01	.09	.01	.11*
Income	.04	.05	-.04	.05	-.04
Age	.20*	.20	.11	.20	.11*
Sex	.22*	.27	.10	.27	.10
TV Viewing	.22*	.33	.13*	.33	.11
Newspaper Reading	-.04	.33	-.03	.33	-.04
Network News Viewing	.39*	.47	.33*	.47	.32*
Gratifications Sought:					
Entertainment	-.02	.47	-.14*	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.06	.48	.17*	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.12	.48	.10	---	---
Surveillance	.04	.48	-.10	---	---
Attention to 60 Minutes	.12	.51	.08	.50	.08
Dependency on 60 Minutes	.44*	.60	.42*	.59	.39*
Gratifications Obtained:					
Entertainemnt	.06	.60	.08	---	---
Interpersonal Utility	.13	.61	-.13	---	---
Para-social Interaction	.13	.62	-.23*	---	---
Surveillance	.20*	.62	.12	---	---
Gratification Discrepancies:					
Entertainment	.11	---	---	.59	.11*
Interpersonal Utility	-.14	---	---	.60	-.14*
Para-social Interaction	-.15	---	---	.61	-.15*
Surveillance	.10	---	---	.62	.10
Variance Accounted for by Each Block:					
Demographic Variables		.073*		.073*	
Habitual Media Exposure		.145*		.145*	
Gratifications Sought		.015*		----	
Attention/Dependency		.129*		.130*	
Gratifications Obtained		.029*		----	
Gratification Discrepancies		----		.031*	
Total Variance Accounted For:		.391*		.379*	

* Significant at $p < .01$.

Table 6. -- Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses Showing the Expanded Discrepancy Model in the Prediction of Frequency of Viewing Network Evening News Programs and 60 Minutes

	Network News (n=195)			60 Minutes (n=173)		
	r	R	Beta	r	R	Beta
Education	-.08	.08	.11*	-.01	.01	.10*
Income	.03	.09	-.06	.04	.05	-.04
Age	.18*	.19	.02	.20*	.20	.08
Sex	-.04	.21	-.08	.22*	.27	.11*
TV Viewing	.34*	.36	.29*	.22*	.33	.10
Newspaper Reading	-.10	.37	-.03	-.04	.33	-.05
Program Viewing[a]	.39*	.49	.22*	.39*	.47	.34*
Attention to Program	.31*	.53	.19*	.12	.50	.05
Dependency on Program	.35*	.57	.20*	.44*	.59	.42*
Gratification Discrepancies:[b]						
Surveillance:						
1. Issues of day	-.06	.57	-.05	.14	.59	.05
2. Issues affecting me	.07	.57	.01	.10	.59	.10*
3. Watch government	-.00	.57	-.05	.07	.59	-.04
Interpersonal Utility:						
9. Supprot viewpoints	.03	.57	-.00	.14	.59	.04
7. Interesting talk	.02	.57	-.09	.07	.59	.04
8. Pass information	.12	.58	.05	-.03	.63	-.25*
Para-social Interaction:						
10. Compare to comments	.03	.58	-.04	.07	.63	-.01
11. Know reporters	.18*	.59	.13*	-.05	.64	-.10
12. Human quality	.06	.59	.00	-.01	.64	-.14*
Entertainment:						
4. Relax	.09	.60	.05	.06	.65	.01
5. Entertaining	.04	.60	-.06	.08	.65	.08
6. Dramatic	.18*	.60	.08	.03	.65	.08
Variance Accounted for by Each Block:						
Demographic Variables		.043*			.073*	
Habitual Media Exposure		.198*			.145*	
Attention/Dependency		.081*			.130*	
Surveillance Discrepancies		.006			.004	
Interpersonal Utility Discrepancies		.008			.041*	
Para-social Interaction Discrepancies		.018*			.022*	
Entertainment Discrepancies		.009*			.012*	
Total Varaince Accounted For:		.363*			.428*	

[a] Program Viewing refers to frequency of 60 Minutes in the network news analysis, and to frequency of viewing network news in the 60 Minutes analysis.

[b] The items described below the gratification discrepancy categories are keyed to the items as presented in Table 1.

* Significant at $p < .01$.

Table 7. -- Canonical Correlation Analyses Relating Demographic, Habitual Media Exposure, Gratifications Sought and Obtained Measures with Frequency of Viewing, Attention, and Dependency Measures for Network Evening News Programs and 60 Minutes

	Network News (n=195)		60 Minutes (n=173)	
Coefficients For First Set:	Root 1	Root 2	Root 1	Root 2
Education	-.14	.37	.10	.18
Income	.29	-.30	.07	-.08
Age	.21	-.19	.15	.27
Sex	-.07	-.21	.36	.33
TV Viewing	-.06	.85	-.20	.25
Newspaper Reading	-.11	-.07	.19	-.03
Program Viewing[a]	.47	.38	.13	.69
Gratifications Sought:				
Entertainment	-.35	-.12	-.02	-.23
Interpersonal Utility	-.04	-.05	-.12	.39
Para-social Interaction	-.06	-.05	-.23	.13
Surveillance	-.08	.15	.09	-.02
Gratifications Obtained:[b]				
Entertainment	.30	-.01	.04	.17
Interpersonal Utility	.19	-.44	.36	-.46
Para-social Interaction	.36	.23	.36	-.40
Surveillance	.25	-.24	.39	.25
Coeffeicents for Second Set:				
Program Viewing[c]	.21	1.05	-.03	.99
Attention to Program	.36	-.08	.06	-.47
Dependency on Program	.75	-.61	1.00	-.26
Canonical Correlation	.63	.46	.63	.53
Eigenvalue	.40	.21	.63	.53
Bartlett's Chi-Square	148.47	55.26	146.47	69.92
Degrees of Freedom	45	28	45	28
Significance	$p < .001$	$p < .002$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

[a]Program Viewing in first set refers to frequency of 60 Minutes viewing in network news analysis, and to frequency of viewing network news in 60 Minutes analysis

[b]Gratifications Obtained measures refer to network news in network news analysis and to 60 Minutes in 60 Minutes analysis.

[c]Program Viewing in second set refers to frequency of viewing network news in network news analysis, and to frequency of viewing 60 Minutes in 60 Minutes analysis.

BECKER, L.B. (1979) "Measurement of gratifications." Communication Research 6: 54-73

BECKER, S.L., R. PEPPER, L. WENNER, and J.K. KIM (1979) "Presidential debates, information flow and the shaping of meanings," in S. Kraus (ed.) The Great Debates of 1976: Carter versus Ford. Bloomington, IN: Indiana Univ. Press.

GALLOWAY, J.J. and F.L. MEEK (1981) "Audience uses and gratifications: an expectancy model." Communication Research 8: 435-450.

KATZ, E., J.G. BLUMLER, and M. GUREVITCH (1974) "Utilization of mass communication by the individual," in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

LERNER, D. (1974) "Toward a theory of modernization: a set of considerations," in W. Schramm and D.F. Roberts (eds.) The Process and Effects of Mass Communications, 2nd ed. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

LOMETTI, G.E., B. REEVES, and C.R. BYBEE (1977) "Investigating the assumptions of uses and gratifications research." Communication Research 4: 321-338.

McLEOD, J.M. and L.B. BECKER (1974) "Testing the validity of gratifications measures through political effects analysis," in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McLEOD, J.M., C.R. BYBEE, and J.A. DURALL (1980) "Gratifications sought and received as criteria for mass media evaluation." Presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

PALMGREEN, P. and J.D. RAYBURN (1979) "Uses and gratifications and exposure to public television: a discrepancy approach." Communication Research 6: 155-180.

_____(1982) "Gratifications sought and media exposure: an expectancy value model." Communication Research 9: 561-580.

PALMGREEN, P., L.A. WENNER, and J.D. RAYBURN (1980) "Relations between gratifications sought and obtained: a study of television news." Communication Research 7: 161-192.

_____(1981) "Gratification discrepancies and news program choice." Communication Research 8: 451-478.

ROBERTS, D.L. and C.M. BACHEN (1981) "Mass Communication Effects." Annual Review of Psychology 32: 307-356.

WENNER, L.A. (1982) "Gratifications sought and obtained in program dependency: a study of network evening news programs and 60 Minutes." Communication Research 9: 539-560.